

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee Meeting  
February 20, 2003  
NWIFC Conference Center  
Minutes**

---

Attendees:

Butts, Sally	USFWS
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Ehinger, Bill	DOE
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Green, Matthew	DOE
Grizzel, Jeff	DNR, Federal Assurances
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Harlow, Eric	WFLC
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Herman, Jed	DNR
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Keller, Steve	NMFS
Lippke, Bruce	University of Washington
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER Co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
McNaughton, Geoff	AMPA
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Price, Dave	WDFW
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	WDFW
Raines, Mary	NWIFC
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely
Robinson, Tom	DNR, WSAOC
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Consulting Group
Stringer, Angela	Campbell Group
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR
Sweitzer, Dave	Hardwoods Commission

## Summary of Decisions and Tasks

Decision/Task	Section of Minutes
December and January CMER minutes were approved	Minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DNR will work with UPSAG to design a presentation illustrating what each UPSAG rule tool project is designed to do and this policy will be made to policy when guidance is requested.</li> <li>Sturhan will check the status of the GIS Wetlands layer project and will research the funding mechanism.</li> <li>DNR will work on an internal to align DNR priorities with CMER and will then work with CMER on a workplan. Progress will be reported in April</li> </ul>	Rule Tools
Eric Schroff will lead the effort to develop a compliance monitoring protocol will provide progress report at the March CMER meeting.	Rule Tools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CMER approved UPSAGs request for approval to forward <i>Estimation of multi-season evapotranspiration in relation to vegetation cover for regions with rainy-winter / dry-summer climate</i> to SRC committee.</li> <li>CMER approved BTSAGs request for \$35,000 in project development funds for further study site reconnaissance work. There are stipulations surrounding this approval and funds will only be spent if the contract cannot be negotiated using other bull trout dollars.</li> <li>CMER Approved LWAGs request for \$40,000 to identify the patterns of habitat use for Dunn's and Van Dyke;s salamanders.</li> <li>CMER requested that RSAG prepare additional background information for their request for \$71,000 to assist DNR And USFS in collecting pre-treatment data for a Type N stream buffer effectiveness study. This request will be reviewed again by CMER in March.</li> <li>CMER asked ISAG to address concerns regarding their request for \$150,000 to fund additional Westside validation data gathering. ISAG will re-submit this request at the March CMER meeting</li> <li>CMER approved the ISAG request to replicate the eastside data collection effort that occurred in 2001 at an amount not to exceed \$200,000 if it is determined that the additional data is necessary to implement the model on the eastside.</li> <li>CMER approved the RSAG request for \$15,000 to help fund development of a red alder growth and yield model.</li> <li>CMER asked WETSAG to submit the questions that will be asked of the SRC along with the request for SRC review of</li> </ul>	SAG Requests

the Forested Wetland Literature Review and Synthesis	
McNaughton and Rowton will work to draft procedures for how and when budgetary changes will be submitted to FFR policy and FPB for approval.	SAG Requests
SAGs were asked to review the approved priority list and to submit a list of projects that will get underway this year.  In March, CMER will discuss concerns that arose as a result of prioritization. See this section of the minutes for more information.	CMER/Policy Summary
CMER Staff is working on completing the workplan and will work with SAGs to accurately complete the document.	CMER Workplan
Pleus will lead an effort to draft a procedure for identification of project managers and what their duties will consist of. See this section of the minutes for details.  McNaughton will obtain a copy of the IT publication outlining duties of project managers and will get that document to Pleus.  SAGs will provide names of existing project managers to Rowton by March 6 <sup>th</sup> . This list will be distributed at the March CMER meeting.	Project Management
SAGs are asked to discuss CMER staffing needs before the March meeting in preparation for a discussion on this issue during the meeting.	Staff Assignments

### **Minutes:**

Changes to the January CMER minutes were reviewed during the meeting.

**CMER Consensus:** December and January CMER minutes were approved as submitted.

**Budget:** A revised budget sheet was distributed. This sheet was submitted to FFR Policy and to the FPB for final approval. On February 19<sup>th</sup>, the FPB approved the following:

- CMER Effectiveness monitoring program rankings
- \$57,000 additional funding for the landslide mapping and hazard classification protocols
- \$60,000 for development of the Compliance monitoring design
- \$200,000 for intensive monitoring, with the requirement that matching funds must be found before this money can be spent

Hanson updated CMER that Bull trout funding has been reduced by 50% and is now approximately \$546,000. Bull trout projects will now need to compete with other CMER projects for available funds.

Green asked why budget allocations do not reflect the agreed upon priorities (line items 8, 10 and 12). Quinn explained that some of these projects/programs have no money in 2003 because they are not designed yet. The programs are being staged in as they are ready to go; CMER, Policy and the FPB agreed that all components are important. Some will start sooner than others but the vision is that all will eventually be completed.

Raines suggested a re-wording for line 44 on the budget sheet.

The \$200,000 budgeted for DFC validation currently will be zeroed out as no validation efforts will occur this year.

---

**Rule Tools:** Rule tools were presented to FFR Policy in January and it was made clear that CMER had not prioritized them. Policy did receive the update that some of these are in progress and moving along well and that Policy guidance will be requested soon for the PIP, DFC and LHZ rule tools. There are also those things that are ongoing and in process and do not need to be prioritized at this time. There were also several rule tools that have not been started yet; discussion with DNR is needed to determine how to prioritize these. DNR is going to discuss these rule tools briefly today. **Please see attached final summary from the 1/29/03 FFR Policy meeting for more detail.**

Sturhan said that DNR will work with Policy on (DFC, PIP, and LHZ). Their initial look at the rule tools is still progressing and field needs are being scoped. The FP division supports all the rule tools and believes some are more immediately necessary than others. The division has ranked them only in terms of immediate need. Their current efforts will focus on : streamtyping, the wetlands GIS layer, the LHZ and related slope stability tools, and the eastside nomograph.

Herman added that DNR will work with CMER on the rule tools, especially those that are urgently needed. Outcomes from effectiveness monitoring project will also help DNR show how the rules are working.

#### **Assignments:**

- Concerns were raised regarding the LHZ projects. Sturhan said that DNR will be working with UPSAG to design a presentation illustrating what each project is designed to do and how they all relate to one another. This presentation will be made to policy and guidance will be requested. Concerns were also raised regarding the separation of these projects and how this can be done in a way that is more logical to others.
- Concerns were raised regarding funding for the GIS Wetlands layer. Sturhan will check the status of the project and will look into the funding mechanisms.
- CMER's overall role in funding the rule tools needs further exploration. There was no assignment made to complete this task. Collaboration was encouraged and the ISAG model is a good one to look to for guidance.
- Smitch reminded the group that FFR policy has asked for an institutional alignment between CMER and DNR on these rule tools. DNR is responsible for implementing

rule tools and CMER needs to know where they fit into the process. DNR will build an internal strategy for how to move forward with these alignments and will then work with CMER to develop a workplan. A progress report on this work will be delivered to CMER during the April meeting.

**Compliance monitoring assignment:** \$60,000 is allocated for DNR to develop compliance monitoring. Herman indicated that Eric Schroff, Operations Manager, will take the lead on this effort. A progress report will be delivered at the March 20<sup>th</sup> CMER meeting. Quinn said that this protocol should be designed by DNR in coordination with others (i.e. extensive monitoring). Pavel said the TFW has done two compliance monitoring projects and the last one was shelved before it was finalized (1992). Pavel said that the Oregon approach was also good. McConnell suggested that the small group look at the TFW report and the Oregon model as they design monitoring.

---

## **SAG Requests**

UPSAG: request for approval to forward *Estimation of multi-season evapotranspiration in relation to vegetation cover for regions with rainy-winter / dry-summer climate* to SRC committee. The purpose of this report was to validate the model used to develop the rule.

Quinn asked what we are asking the SRC to do. Raines said that there is a package of materials going to the SRC and it is modeled on the last completed review. Palmquist can provide these materials upon request.

**CMER consensus:** CMER approved this request.

BTSAG Update: request for up to \$35,000 project development funds for study site reconnaissance work. This is an addition to the previously approved contract for Cupp and the SAG has developed a plan for the reconnaissance with Cupp. The contract will be negotiated to reflect this addition of \$35,000. McFadden will be in charge of coordinating site selection with Cupp. Schuett-Hames will be the project manager. The funding source for this project is federal and if the contract can be negotiated to include the additional \$35,000 expense, no other CMER approval will be necessary. If the contract cannot be negotiated this way, then BTSAG will ask CMER to approve a \$35,000 expenditure of project development funds to complete the project.

**CMER consensus:** CMER approved this request. McNaughton will attempt to negotiate the contract using bull trout monies rather than project development funds but project development funds are approved if necessary.

LWAG: Request for \$40,000 to identify the patterns of habitat use for Dunn's and Van Dyke's salamanders. This is part of the *Habitat Relationships of Dunn's and Van Dyke's Salamanders*. A question was raised as to whether this increase should go through the FFR Policy and the FPB. There is a special FPB meeting in March.

**CMER consensus:** CMER approved this request. It will move forward to FFR Policy and the FPB. The co-chairs will draft a letter to the FFR policy co-chairs seeking their guidance prior to the March FPB Special meeting where this request will be considered.

**Assignment:** Procedures for how and when budgetary changes will be submitted to FFR policy and FPB for approval is needed to guide CMER. Robinson said that yesterday, the chair made clear that we need to build room into these contracts to maneuver a little. Rowton will work with McNaughton to clarify this process.

RSAG: request for \$71,000 to assist DNR and USFS in collecting pre-treatment data for a Type N stream buffer effectiveness study. Project is *Type N Effectiveness Experimental Study*. Four treatments will be tested on type N streams (no buffer, continuous, variable, unharvested). For a detailed study design, contact RSAG. The \$71,000 is to help them with the preharvest work and this is a one time request. Helping with this project will give us the ability to get answers that we otherwise would not be able to afford.

Concerns:

- study site selection is not random
- unstable slopes are not part of study
- DNR's ability to fund the future aspects of the study given the difficulty of securing future funding and whether this will be requested by the cooperators
- are there opportunities for CMER to add to the number of sites
- when a study design is settled on, will the other entities put this through an SRC review before implementation
- Clarification of whether this is necessary to answer questions relevant to CMER work.
- Can the variable buffer scheme conform to Forests and Fish prescriptions and if not, why not.

CMER was very supportive of this type of cooperative effort both to leverage funding and to gain valuable information at a lower cost.

**CMER consensus:** RSAG is to go back and get the information requested above and bring this request back to CMER at the March meeting. Any additional questions should be directed to Ehinger by February 27<sup>th</sup>.

ISAG: ISAG is requesting \$560,000 for three projects Dave Price said that the westside validation study design is the prevailing priority within ISAG, eastside is number two and validation of the eastside is number three, however ISAG did not have consensus on project ranking. ISAG clarified that approval of this funding request will essentially move funding requests currently scheduled for 2004 up to 2003, thus reducing outyear funding.

**Westside Validation:** ISAG would like to develop this protocol to find the model-derived mapped point on the ground and characterize the differences between model error and field error. The request is for an additional \$150,000 for the streamtyping project to

fund the Westside validation data gathering. This project is time sensitive because it informs the study design and implementation of the model, thus, using the upcoming field season is preferred (beginning on March 1 and terminating on July 15<sup>th</sup>). This study is the initial step for field validation and will provide some input to CMER, prior to implementation of the model, of the differences between model error and field error.

Concerns: A better description, indicating the questions to be answered and implications of those decisions, with a study design would help CMER to feel more comfortable approving this request.

**CMER Consensus:** ISAG is to address concerns noted above and resubmit this request in March.

**Eastside data collection request:** This request is to approve a replicate study of the eastside data collection effort that occurred in 2001 at an amount not to exceed \$200,000. this study would provide additional data for model development and testing. The amount of data needed is not known at present. However, ISAG generally feels that more data is needed (e.g. Fransen said that the problem is the stopping rule; it cannot be modeled without sufficient data.) If this study is delayed until the stats group determines how much data is needed for the model, it may be too late to conduct field work in 2003.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER approved the request to replicate the study of the eastside data collection effort that occurred in 2001 at an amount not to exceed \$200,000 if it is determined that the additional data is necessary to implement the model on the eastside. This additional data collection effort will not progress if it is determined that there is already sufficient data from the additional cooperators that have been asked for data.

**Eastside validation data:** *seasonal variability data collection.*

**CMER Consensus:** Price asked that we table this discussion and ISAG will resubmit this request in March. CMER concurred with this request.

RSAG2: request for \$15,000 to develop a red alder growth and yield model. CMER would be contributing to this study, not funding it entirely. There is a cooperative process in place for this study that CMER will be part of. Pleus said this seems like a good opportunity to leverage CMER dollars. RSAG assured CMER that the information developed in this process will be useful and relevant and that this is by far the cheapest way to get the information.

**CMER Consensus:** This request was approved as submitted.

WETSAG: request for SRC review of the *Forested Wetland Literature Review and Synthesis*, DNR Contract #02-19. WETSAG would like to be assured that the interpretation and synthesis of existing literature is accurate and complete. WETSAG is

in consensus with regards to the SRC review request. Concerns: CMER would like to review the questions WETSAG will be asking the SRC.

**CMER Consensus:** WETSAG will formulate the questions they will be asking the SRC and will forward these questions to CMER for review prior to approval of this request. The request can be resubmitted at the March CMER meeting with this additional information.

---

**SRC Update:** McNaughton suggested moving ahead to sign the contract with the University of Washington despite CMER concerns. The small group formed during the January meeting reached the conclusion that we should go ahead and sign and then address concerns with the copyrights as they come up.

Upcoming requests for SRC review include: two projects for model validation, the groundwater final report, a WETSAG literature review, and DFC later in the spring.

---

**Data Request:** McNaughton said that he has been asked to look into the legal issues associated with data release. The Public Disclosure Act includes only limited exclusions and CMER data does not qualify for the exemption. The opinion of DNR staff is that all CMER data submitted to DNR is subject to release. Robinson said that DNR can charge for all reproduction costs associated with the data release, including staff time. To clarify the process for releasing data, all requests are required to go through Geoff McNaughton.

---

**CMER/Policy Summary:** Martin said that we have indirectly talked a lot about what happened at the CMER policy joint session. For those who were not there, the co-chairs presented the integrated monitoring program. A key message was that effectiveness, extensive and intensive monitoring are integrated and are all important to the overall program. Policy agreed to the priorities and sent a clear message that CMER is to move forward with effectiveness monitoring. CMER was also asked to document the prioritization process that was used to develop these priorities. Policy is expecting CMER to revisit this each year and to submit revised priorities to policy and the FPB on a yearly basis. Martin asked for volunteers to work on documenting a ranking process to be drafted and approved by CMER before December 2003. Joseph Pavel volunteered to take the lead.

**Assignment:** Each SAG needs to review the list and note what projects will get started this year.

Concerns: Mobbs asked if, when we initially separated effectiveness monitoring from rule tools, it was with the understanding that some rule tools were very important. Quinn clarified that policy said that DNR should take the lead and CMER will assist with rule tool development as-needed. CMER is to lead in the effectiveness monitoring efforts. Schuett-Hames suggests that we also begin working on the extensive and intensive monitoring portions of the workplan. We need to begin to identify who is in charge of



what and what we are doing. Quinn added that it was clear that there is a big potential overlap between extensive monitoring and compliance monitoring. Pleus suggested that we also start formulating the big picture for CMER. Raines wants to ensure that we schedule the conversation soon about a plan for the intensive monitoring funds that were approved.

**CMER Consensus:** Discussions to alleviate the above concerns occur at the March CMER meeting.

---

**CMER Workplan:** Revision of the workplan is now commencing. CMER staff is taking a lead, over the next two months, to complete another phase of the workplan. The CMER staff will contact individuals within the SAGs, as necessary, to get clarification on programs and projects, etc. After all the information is pulled together, we will begin discussions to clarify how the intensive and extensive programs fit into the workplan.

---

**Project Management – Internal Review:** A project manager must be identified for each project. This process needs to be more formal than we have had in the past. McNaughton said that he is ultimately the project manager for each project and needs to know who is managing them at the SAG level. Quinn suggested that we ask SAG members to manage the individual projects. Sturhan said that we will run into the problem of people's workloads changing. Without some kind of commitment from the employer that the person will have time, we will run into problems. Fransen and Rowe suggested paying a contract administrator for these projects. Heide suggested drafting a document that details the amount of time that people will be spending on this. If people cannot sign up for that amount of time, they need to say that and the project needs to be postponed until such time as there is someone to manage the project. Heide also suggested that a regular schedule of project updates be developed. If the time is not available, then the time is not available and we need to pay for it. Grizzel said that the need for a project manager will be proportional to the cost of the project. Sometimes you will need a paid project manager and other times you will not. Hansen asked if CMER funds can easily be made available to others to do this. McNaughton suggested that DNR is resisting additional administration costs of CMER. Sturhan said that one of the things she was hoping to do, with the handbook committee, was to write up job descriptions for these things. Grizzel followed up on the comment made by McNaughton regarding administration. That pitch needs to be delivered to the Policy. Robinson said that, though we are all donating time, we need to define our problem to policy and draft a potential solution for them. Robinson also suggested looking at this from a programmatic level, not a project level (i.e. CMER as a whole). Schuett-Hames also said that we need to point out the consequences of not dealing with the problem.

**CMER Consensus:** identification of project managers is critical to success. As the plan is revised, we need to consider this programmatic approach. Pleus said this is integral to the Handbook committee work.

**Assignments:**

- Any additional ideas should be forwarded to Pleus and he will accumulate the information.
  - Robinson said that the IT board has a series of people who manage projects and Pete Thomas has an illustration of their responsibilities. McNaughton will get this information to Pleus.
  - SAGS are to provide the names of existing project managers and contact information to Heather Rowton. If project managers are not identified, please explain how the project is managed.
- 

#### **SAG Issues:**

Rowe said that CMER should consider special requirements that will be necessary for landowners to follow who submit sites for CMER research (i.e. relevant federal permits). These requirements should be communicated to landowners when they are asked for sites, not after they agree. Martin updated Rowe that there have been discussions about this and a process is under development. Heide agreed that we need to meet with federal agencies to find out what is necessary to implement the studies. Hansen said that the only requirement would be a Section 10 research permit from federal agencies. McNaughton said that sometimes the permit stipulations are also a problem. McFadden is the leader in this effort and is working to address concerns.

---

**Staff Assignments:** Martin suggested that this should be a standing agenda item. McNaughton is the person who assigns CMER staff and we need to be sure that CMER is going through McNaughton when they need assistance. Schuett-Hames is the CMER staff manager and will work with McNaughton to facilitate staff assignments. The SAGs should not be requesting staff assistance directly.

**Assignment:** SAGs were asked to discuss CMER staffing needs and come to the next meeting prepared to discuss this. This will be a regular agenda item in the future.

---

**Science topic:** amphibian resample is tentative for March. Remember that a DFC workshop is scheduled for March 19<sup>th</sup>.

---

#### **Review Tasks from January Meeting**

Fish Passage: ISAG has developed options for policy. The CMER co-chairs looked at this and it has not been submitted to CMER yet. Price said that ISAG is suggesting that policy staff provide feedback to CMER about how best to present this information to FFR policy. **Please see Joint CMER/Policy 1/29/03 meeting notes for a definition of “policy staff”.**

The PIP report is not out yet and will be forwarded at a later date.

Upcoming policy requests will be a standard agenda item at future CMER meetings.